

### **REMARKS**

The removal of the prior rejections based upon art is appreciated. The new rejections stated in the final office action are addressed specifically below as follows. This amendment is filed with a request for continued examination. Each issue raised in the final office action has been considered and is addressed below.

Claims 1-4 and 6-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Doshi, U.S. Patent No. 6,144,667. The claims have been amended as indicated above and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner refers to the summary of Doshi and applies it to each of the rejected claims. The basic operation in Doshi is allowing a computer user surfing the internet to also place a call through the computer. This can be useful for web commerce transactions, for example. In columns 5 and 6, Doshi provides the example of an air travel booking transaction. Doshi discloses a method for a computer user to use the computer to contact a flight agent after surfing for airfares. C7, L51 – C8, L4. The voice/data network gateway 120 controls access to a public switched telephone network 100, which may consist of “local end offices, tandem offices, toll offices, international gateways or international offices.” C9, L1-5. Access is granted according to a telephone services such as AT&T Worldshare, with a computer user having to provide an account for access to the telephone services. C8, L1-8.

The Examiner has interpreted this, apparently, to correspond to the phone service in the claims. The present invention concerns localization of phone services via the Internet. That is not disclosed or suggested to Doshi, and the amendments to the claims emphasize those differences. In Doshi, a computer 10 accesses the Internet and then the voice/data gateway 120, which is interfaced with telephone company networks. Standard network and telephone company account charges will apply.

Doshi provides a “network-based method for initiating and completing a voice telephony call via the Internet comprises the steps of receiving call completion data at a voice/data network gateway of the public switched telephone network from

an Internet application web server.” In other words, as seen in FIG. 1 a web server 15 connects to a telecommunications network 100 to allow a user 10 of a computer to place a call through the computer. As explained in columns 5 and 6, when a computer user is surfing the web, instead of using a phone, the user can click “on a call request icon, such as a ‘call me’ icon, communicates via a telecommunications data link 30 with a voice/data network gateway 120 of the public or toll switched 20 telecommunications network 100.” C6, L12-25. FIG. 4 also provides the basic hardware components of a preferred embodiment server device. While the office action has stated without explanation that Doshi provides “local” phone services, Doshi instead merely provides access to standard telephone company resources via the gateway 120. There is no access provided to local phone services via the local phone lines of a plurality of host computers as required by the amended claims.

The inventions of claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 11 and 12 (as amended) are not directed to general Internet telephony that requires a specialized server that accesses the telecommunications network. The present invention instead localizes phone lines (such as private party phone lines) by allowing such a phone line to be accessed via the Internet. Local calls are often unlimited for a small fee. In contrast, long distance calls can be expensive. By the method of claim 1 and with the system of claim 10, a client in China could access a phone line of a host in Chicago, IL, USA and not incur any long distance fees. Because the server is connected to a plurality of hosts, other options might be Dublin, Ireland or Melbourne, Australia. Similarly, the server of claim 2 provides such localization. The host of claim 4 provides a resource for such localization. The client of claim 8 can take advantage of such localization. The methods of claims 11 and 12 provide fee businesses that leverage such localization.

The amendments emphasize that server can “localize” the plurality of phone lines of a plurality of hosts. In this way, with the assistance of the server, a client can use any one of the phone lines of the hosts as if it was physically connected to the phone line and therefore only incur charges for a call within the local area of the phone line. With the amendments, because the server is connected to a plurality of hosts, there can be a plurality of locations that are provided to the client as localized phone services. Doshi, in contrast, merely provides enhanced Internet telephone

services that allow a convenient data exchange and call to be made through normal phone company controlled resources with normal toll charges while web surfing. C8, L23-45.

The claimed invention provides a number of advantages not provided or suggested by Doshi's combined Internet/phone company access. Page 2, lines 26-30 of the present application, states that the invention enables "minimizing long-distance or toll charges" by using a phone line (of the host) with the lowest charge. Page 2 also states in lines 16-20 that a "host machine or banks of host machines are connected to telephone systems in the local geographic area." This permits a client to make use of the phone services "as if the client was using a phone connection in the local geographic area." The Internet connection is used to access the host's phone line, but the phone line of the host is what provides the "phone services and communications in claim 1". On page 6, lines 4-7 it is stated that the host (BPLAP) "will receive all audio which is transmitted from IPLU(s) who have answered, and transmit it over the phone line". Page 3, lines 6-8. The voice communications of the host are clearly provided to the client "over the phone line" of the host. This is a completely different model from connecting to a server that interfaces with a phone company as in Doshi.

In addressing claims 11 and 12, the Examiner refers to a plurality of host computers in Doshi. Doshi FIG. 1 shows more than one computer 10, but these do not act as hosts as required by any of the claims because these computers do not allow other computers to access their associate phone lines.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 101. While Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation, further amendments are made to resolve the issue and in view of the uncertain status of the *Bilski* case cited by the Examiner which may be overturned in whole or in part. In any event, claim 11 has been amended to be clearly tied into computer based business with access provided via the server computer. This should satisfy the Examiner's concerns about §101.

For all of the above reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is requested. Should the examiner have any questions or concerns that could be resolved by a telephone conference, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

/STEVEN P. FALLON/

By

Steven P. Fallon  
Registration No. 35,132  
Attorney for Applicant

April 7, 2010

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978